arXiv:1205.4317v1 [math.FA] 19 May 2012

A NEW ISOMORPHIC ℓ_1 PREDUAL NOT ISOMORPHIC TO A COMPLEMENTED SUBSPACE OF A $C(K)$ SPACE

I. GASPARIS

Abstract. We construct a subspace X of $C(\omega^\omega)$ with dual isomorphic to ℓ_1 and such that neither X embeds into c_0, nor $C(\omega^\omega)$ embeds into X. As a consequence, X is not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of a $C(K)$ space.

1. Introduction

Y. Benyamini and J. Lindenstrauss [8] constructed an isometric ℓ_1 predual E which is not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of a $C(K)$ space. D. Alspach and Y. Benyamini [3] showed, with a different proof, that a variation of E had the same property. Alspach's quotient of $C(\omega^\omega)$ which does not embed into any $C(\alpha)$, $\alpha < \omega_1$ [2], is an isometric ℓ_1 predual which contains a complemented copy of E and so it is also not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of a $C(K)$ space. We remark that E is isometric to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$ and that all aforementioned examples contain a copy of $C(\omega^\omega)$.

The preceding examples are related to the problem of the isomorphic classification of the complemented subspaces of $C(K)$ spaces ([20], [21]). By combining results from [1], [7], [13] one obtains the following structural result for complemented subspaces of $C(K)$ spaces with separable dual:

Theorem 1.1. *Let Y be a complemented subspace of $C(K)$ with Y^* separable. Then either Y is isomorphic to c_0, or $C(\omega^\omega)$ embeds into Y.*

The proofs that the preceding examples of ℓ_1 preduals are not isomorphic to complemented subspaces of $C(K)$ spaces are rather hard and part of this difficulty lies on the fact that they all contain copies of $C(\omega^\omega)$. As a consequence, the preceding structural result can not be used to distinguish between these ℓ_1 preduals and the complemented subspaces of $C(K)$ spaces.

It follows directly from Theorem 1.1, that any isomorphic ℓ_1 predual not isomorphic to c_0 and not containing $C(\omega^\omega)$ isomorphically, is not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of a $C(K)$ space. The purpose of this article, as our next result indicates, is to provide such an example of an ℓ_1 predual.

Theorem 1.2. *There exists an isomorphic ℓ_1 predual X with a normalized, shrinking basis (e_n) satisfying the following properties:*

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46B03; Secondary: 47B38.

Key words and phrases. ℓ_1 predual, projection, Bourgain-Delbaen construction.

(1) *X is isometric to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$.*
(2) *Every normalized weakly null sequence in X admits a subsequence which is either equivalent to the c_0 basis, or equivalent to a subsequence of the natural basis of Schreier's space. In particular, (e_n) satisfies the second alternative.*

Recall that Schreier's space [23] is the completion of c_{00} under the norm

$$\|x\| = \sup\{\sum_{i\in F} |x(i)| : |F| \leq \min F\}$$

The unit vector basis of c_{00} then becomes the natural Schauder basis of Schreier's space.

Corollary 1.3. *Neither X embeds into c_0, nor $C(\omega^\omega)$ embeds into X. Therefore, X is not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of a $C(K)$ space.*

Proof. Since (e_n) has a a subsequence equivalent to a subsequence of the natural basis of Schreier's space, and since none of these subsequences is equivalent to the c_0 basis, we infer that X is not isomorphic to a subspace of c_0.

One consequence of Theorem 1.2 is that the only spreading models of X are c_0 and ℓ_1. On the other hand, it is not hard to see that $C(\omega^\omega)$ admits spreading models which are not equivalent to the c_0 or to the ℓ_1 bases. In fact, it is well known ([19], [6]), that $C(\omega^\omega)$ is a space universal for all unconditional spreading models. It follows now that $C(\omega^\omega)$ is not isomorphic to a subspace of X.

Finally, we deduce from the above and Theorem 1.1 that X is not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of a $C(K)$ space. $\square$

Remark . *It was pointed out to us by D. Alspach, that X is not even isomorphic to a quotient of a $C(K)$ space with K being countable and compact. Indeed, let $Q\colon C(K) \to X$ be a bounded linear surjection, where K is countable. It is shown in* [4] *that the Szlenk index* [24] *of any subspace of Schreier's space spanned by a subsequence of the natural basis equals the Szlenk index of $C(\omega^\omega)$, which in turn equals ω^2* [22]. *It follows that the Szlenk index of X also equals ω^2 and therefore, as K is countable, there is some $\epsilon > 0$ such that the ϵ-Szlenk index of $Q^* B_{X^*}$ exceeds ω. One deduces from the main result of* [1] *that Q is an isomorphism on some subspace isomorphic to $C(\omega^\omega)$, contradicting Theorem 1.2. Combining this result with that of* [7] *we conclude that X is not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of any $C(K)$ space.*

The construction of X requires a new method for producing $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ spaces ([15], [16]). More precisely we use a dual version of the Bourgain-Delbaen method [10]. The latter has been instrumental to some recent developments in Banach space theory, namely the solution of the scalar-plus- compact problem [5] and the universality of the class of ℓ_1 preduals among spaces with separable dual [11]. Theorem 2.1 gives sufficient conditions on a norming subset of the dual ball of a Banach space with a basis, in order for the space to be $\mathcal{L}_\infty$.

We use standard Banach space facts and terminology, as may be found in [17]. By a subspace of a Banach space we shall always mean an infinite-dimensional, closed subspace. If $\alpha < \omega_1$ is a countable ordinal, then $C(\alpha)$ stands for $C(K)$ where K is the ordinal interval $[1, \alpha]$ endowed with the order topology.

2. A CRITERION FOR RECOGNIZING $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ SPACES

Notation. Let X be a Banach space with a normalized Schauder basis (e_n) and let $D \subset B_{X^*}$ be a norming set for X (that is, $\|x\| = \sup_{d^* \in D} |d^* x|$ for all $x \in X$) so that $D \subset < e_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N} > \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that $e_n^* \in D$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $|d^*(e_n)| \le 1$ for all $d^* \in D$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We also consider a sequence $\Delta_1 < \Delta_2 < \cdots < \Delta_n < \cdots$ of successive finite intervals of $\mathbb{N}$ whose union is $\mathbb{N}$. Assume that $|\operatorname{supp} d^* \cap \Delta_n| \le 1$ for all $d^* \in D$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We set $D_n = \{d^* \in D : \max \operatorname{supp} d^* \in \Delta_n\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, $D = \cup_n D_n$.

We finally let P_n denote the basis projection onto $[e_i : i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k]$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let X, (e_n), D and (Δ_n) be as above. Let $0 < b < 1/4$. Assume that the following properties hold for all $n \ge 3$:*

1. *$D_n = \{\gamma_i^* : i \in \Delta_n\} \cup \{e_i^* : i \in \Delta_n\}$, where for each $i \in \Delta_n$, $|\operatorname{supp} \gamma_i^*| > 1$, $\max \operatorname{supp} \gamma_i^* = i$ and $\gamma_i^* e_i = 1$.*
2. *Each $d^* \in D_n$ admits a representation of the form*

$$d^* = \rho_1 d_1^* + \rho_2 (d_2^* | \cup_{j=k+1}^{l} \Delta_j) + e_i^*$$

where, $d_1^* \in D_k$ and $d_2^* \in D_l$ for some $1 \le k < l \le n-1$, $i \in \Delta_n$ and $|\rho_1| \le 1$, $|\rho_2| \le b$.

Then, X is an $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ space. Moreover, letting $b_i^* = e_i^*$ for $i \in \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$, while if $n \ge 3$ and $i \in \Delta_n$,

$$b_i^* = (1/2)\gamma_i^* P_{n-1} + e_i^*$$

then (b_i^*) is equivalent to the ℓ_1 basis and $[(b_i^*)] = [(e_i^*)]$. Hence, if (e_n) is shrinking then X^* is isomorphic to ℓ_1.

Proof. For each $n \ge 2$ we define linear maps $T_n \colon \ell_\infty(\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k) \to [e_i : i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k]$ as follows:

$$T_2 x = \sum_{i=1}^{m} x(i) e_i$$

where $m = \max \Delta_2$ and inductively,

$$T_{n+1} x = T_n \pi_n x + \sum_{i \in \Delta_{n+1}} [x(i) - (1/2)\gamma_i^* T_n \pi_n x] e_i$$

where $\pi_n \colon \ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty$ is the restriction operator to the first $\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k$ coordinates and γ_i^* is the unique element of D whose support contains at least two points and i is the maximum of this support. It is clear that

$$P_m T_n x = T_m \pi_m x$$

whenever $m \leq n$ and $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k)$.

It will suffice showing that there exist absolute constants $0 < A < B$ so that

$$A\|x\|_\infty \leq \|T_n x\| \leq B\|x\|_\infty$$

for all $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k)$ and $n \geq 2$.

Let $\rho = (1/2)[1 + 3b/(1-b)]$. Then $1/2 < \rho < 1$ as $0 < b < 1/4$. We choose $\lambda > 0$ such that $\|T_2\| \leq 1 + \lambda/2$, $\|(I - P_1)T_2\| \leq 1 + 3\lambda/2$ and $\lambda > (1-\rho)^{-1}(1-b)^{-1}$.

We first show by induction on $n \geq 2$ that for all $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k)$, $\|x\|_\infty = 1$, there exist $d^* \in \cup_{k=1}^n D_k$ and an initial interval I of $\mathbb{N}$ so that

$$|(d^*|I)(T_n x)| \geq 1/2$$

The assertion trivially holds for $n = 2$, as $e_j^* \in D_k$ whenever $j \in \Delta_k$ for some $k \leq 2$. Assuming the assertion true for some $n \geq 2$, let $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{k=1}^{n+1} \Delta_k)$ with $\|x\|_\infty = 1$ and choose $k \leq n+1$ and $i_0 \in \Delta_k$ so that $|x(i_0)| = 1$. In case $k \leq n$, the assertion follows from the induction hypothesis as $P_n T_{n+1} x = T_n \pi_n x$. If $i_0 \in \Delta_{n+1}$, we distinguish between two cases. The first one occurs when $|\gamma_{i_0}^* T_n \pi_n x| \geq 1$. In this case, $d^* = \gamma_{i_0}^*$ and $I = \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k$ do the job. The second case occurs when $|\gamma_{i_0}^* T_n \pi_n x| < 1$. Now, $d^* = \gamma_{i_0}^*$ and $I = \cup_{k=1}^{n+1} \Delta_k$ fulfill the assertion. This is so since $\text{supp}\gamma_{i_0}^* \cap \Delta_{n+1} = \{i_0\}$.

This completes the inductive step and hence the assertion holds for all $n \geq 2$. It follows now that $\|T_n x\| \geq (2C)^{-1}\|x\|_\infty$ for all $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k)$ and $n \geq 2$, where C stands for the basis constant of (e_n). This yields the required lower estimate.

To obtain the upper estimate, we show by induction on $n \geq 2$ that the following properties hold:

1. $\|d^* T_n\| \leq 1 + \lambda/2$, for all $d^* \in \cup_{k=1}^n D_k$.
2. $\|d^*(I - P_m)T_n\| \leq 1 + 3\lambda/2$, for all $d^* \in \cup_{k=1}^n D_k$ and $m \leq n$.
3. For every $d^* \in D$ and all $m \leq n$ there exists $l > 0$ so that

$$\|d^*(I - P_m)T_n\| \leq (1 + 3\lambda/2)\sum_{k=0}^{l} b^k$$

4. $\|T_n\| \leq \lambda$.

Property (4) above, clearly implies the required upper estimate. We prove, by induction on $n \geq 2$, that all four properties, above, hold. By the choices made initially and since $\lambda > 2$, this is clear when $n = 2$. For the inductive step we assume that all four properties hold for $k \leq n$ and then prove they are also valid for $n + 1$.

We first show that (1) holds for $n+1$. Let $d^* \in D_k$ for some $k \leq n+1$. In case $k \leq n$ then $d^* T_{n+1} x = d^* T_k \pi_k x$ for all $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{j=1}^{n+1} \Delta_j)$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$ and the assertion follows from the induction hypothesis. We next assume that $k = n+1$. Let $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{j=1}^{n+1} \Delta_j)$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$. We distinguish between two cases. The first case occurs when $d^* = e_i^*$ for some $i \in \Delta_{n+1}$. Then,

$$|d^* T_{n+1} x| = |x(i) - (1/2)\gamma_i^* T_n \pi_n x| \leq 1 + \lambda/2$$

by (4) of the induction hypothesis applied on T_n. In the second case, $d^* = \gamma_i^*$ for some $i \in \Delta_{n+1}$. Now,

$$|d^* T_{n+1} x| = |x(i) + (1/2)\gamma_i^* T_n \pi_n x| \leq 1 + \lambda/2$$

and the assertion follows again from (4) of the induction hypothesis applied on T_n. This completes the inductive step for (1).

We next establish (2) for $n+1$. Let $d^* \in D_k$ for some $k \leq n+1$. If $k \leq m$, the assertion is trivial. So we assume that $m < k$. If $k \leq n$, then

$$d^*(I - P_m) T_{n+1} x = d^*(I - P_m) T_k \pi_k x$$

for all $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{j=1}^{n+1} \Delta_j)$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$ and the assertion follows from (2) of the induction hypothesis applied on T_k.

When $k = n+1$, let $x \in \ell_\infty(\cup_{j=1}^{n+1} \Delta_j)$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$. Again, there are two possibilities. If $d^* = e_i^*$ for some $i \in \Delta_{n+1}$, then

$$|d^*(I - P_m) T_{n+1} x| = |x(i) - (1/2)\gamma_i^* T_n \pi_n x| \leq 1 + \lambda/2$$

by (4) of the induction hypothesis applied on T_n.

The other possibility is to have $d^* = \gamma_i^*$ for some $i \in \Delta_{n+1}$. We once again have that

$$d^* T_{n+1} x = x(i) + (1/2)\gamma_i^* T_n \pi_n x$$

while, $d^* P_m T_{n+1} x = \gamma_i^* T_m \pi_m x$ whence,

$$|d^*(I - P_m) T_{n+1} x| = |x(i) + (1/2)\gamma_i^* T_n \pi_n x - \gamma_i^* T_m \pi_m x| \leq 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} + \lambda = 1 + 3\lambda/2$$

by (4) of the induction hypothesis applied on T_n and T_m. So (2) is proved for $n+1$.

We now show that (3) holds for $n+1$. Since (2) has been already verified for $n+1$, it will suffice establishing (3) for all $d^* \in \cup_{k=n+1}^\infty D_k$. To accomplish this we use induction on $k \geq n+1$ to prove that every $d^* \in D_k$ satisfies (3). When $k = n+1$, this follows from (2). Assume the assertion holds for every $d^* \in D_s$ and all $n+1 \leq s < k$ and let $d^* \in D_k$. By the splitting property of the elements of D we may write

$$d^* = \rho_1 d_1^* + \rho_2 d_2^*(I - P_s) + e_i^*$$

where, $d_1^* \in D_s$ and $d_2^* \in D_t$ for some $1 \leq s < t \leq k-1$, $i \in \Delta_k$ and $|\rho_1| \leq 1$, $|\rho_2| \leq b$. If $s \geq n+1$ the assertion for d^* follows by the induction hypothesis applied on d_1^*. If $s \leq m$ then the assertion for d^* follows by the induction hypothesis applied on d_2^*. We now assume that $m < s < n+1$. Applying (2) on d_1^* we obtain that $\|d_1^*(I - P_m) T_{n+1}\| \leq 1 + 3\lambda/2$. On the other hand, the induction hypothesis applied on d_2^* yields some integer $l > 0$ so that $\|d_2^*(I - P_s)T_{n+1}\| \leq (1 + 3\lambda/2)\sum_{j=0}^{l} b^j$. Using the fact that $(I - P_s)(I - P_m) = I - P_s$, we infer that

$$\|d_2^*(I - P_s)(I - P_m)T_{n+1}\| \leq (1 + 3\lambda/2)\sum_{j=0}^{l} b^j$$

whence

$$\|d^*(I - P_m)T_{n+1}\| \leq |\rho_1|(1 + 3\lambda/2) + b(1 + 3\lambda/2)\sum_{j=0}^{l} b^j$$

and so $\|d^*(I - P_m)T_{n+1}\| \leq (1 + 3\lambda/2)\sum_{j=0}^{l+1} b^j$, proving (3) for $n + 1$.

To show (4) holds for $n + 1$, it suffices to prove by induction on k that $\|d^*T_{n+1}\| \leq \lambda$ for all $d^* \in D_k$. When $k \leq n + 1$ this follows from (1) which has been already shown to hold for $n + 1$. Let $k > n + 1$ and assume the assertion holds for all $d^* \in D_s$, $s < k$. Suppose that $d^* \in D_k$. We may write

$$d^* = \rho_1 d_1^* + \rho_2 d_2^*(I - P_s) + e_i^*$$

where, $d_1^* \in D_s$ and $d_2^* \in D_t$ for some $1 \leq s < t \leq k-1$, $i \in \Delta_k$ and $|\rho_1| \leq 1$, $|\rho_2| \leq b$. In case $s \geq n + 1$ the assertion for d^* follows by the induction hypothesis applied on d_1^*.

If $s < n+1$, then $\|d_1^*T_{n+1}\| \leq 1 + \lambda/2$ because of (1). On the other hand, (3) implies that

$$\|d_2^*(I - P_s)T_{n+1}\| \leq (1 + 3\lambda/2)\sum_{j=0}^{l} b^j$$

for some positive integer l. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\|d^*T_{n+1}\| &\leq 1 + \lambda/2 + b(1 + 3\lambda/2)\sum_{j=0}^{l} b^j \\ &< 1 + \lambda/2 + (1 + 3\lambda/2)b(1 - b)^{-1} \\ &= (1 - b)^{-1} + \rho\lambda < \lambda\end{aligned}$$

This completes the inductive step.

Finally, for the moreover assertion, we show by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $(b_i^*)_{i\in\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k}$ acts biorthogonally onto $(T_n e_i)_{i\in\cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k}$ (where, $T_1 = T_2\pi_1$). Indeed, this is trivial when $n \leq 2$. Assume the assertion holds for some $n \geq 2$. Let i and j belong to $\cup_{k=1}^{n+1}\Delta_k$. In case $i \in \cup_{k=1}^{n}\Delta_k$, then since b_i^* is supported by $\cup_{k=1}^{n}\Delta_k$, we obtain that

$$b_i^*T_{n+1}e_j = b_i^*T_n\pi_n e_j = \delta_{i,j}$$

because of the induction hypothesis. If $i \in \Delta_{n+1}$ then $b_i^* = (1/2)\gamma_i^*P_n + e_i^*$ and

$$b_i^*T_{n+1}e_j = (1/2)\gamma_i^*T_n\pi_n e_j + e_i^*e_j - (1/2)\gamma_i^*T_n\pi_n e_j = \delta_{i,j}$$

completing the inductive step. It follows now that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all choices of scalars $(a_i)_{i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k}$, we have

$$\lambda^{-1} \sum_{i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k} |a_i| \leq \| \sum_{i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k} a_i b_i^* \| \leq (2^{-1}C + 1) \sum_{i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k} |a_i|$$

where C is the basis constant. This shows that (b_n^*) is equivalent to the ℓ_1 basis. Since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the span of the (b_i^*)'s, $i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k$, is contained in the span of the (e_i^*)'s, $i \in \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k$, we deduce from the linear independence of the (b_i^*)'s, that $[b_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}] = [e_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}]$. $\square$

Remark . *It is shown in* [14] *that if a $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ space has a separable dual, then this dual must be isomorphic to ℓ_1.*

3. The construction of X

We shall inductively construct a sequence (D_n) of subsets of c_{00} and a decomposition of $\mathbb{N}$ into a sequence of successive intervals (Δ_n), so that $D = \cup_n D_n$ induces a norm on c_{00} and X is the completion of c_{00} under this norm. Moreover, the unit vector basis (e_n) of c_{00} will be a normalized shrinking basis for X which, along with (D_n) and (Δ_n), will fulfill the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1. It will then follow that X^* is isomorphic to ℓ_1.

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F \subset \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq \min F + 2\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$. This is a hereditary and pointwise compact family of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. Note that $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is a maximal, under inclusion, member of $\mathcal{F}$ precisely when $|F| = \min F + 2$. Fix a scalar $0 < b < 1/4$.

We inductively construct a sequence $\Delta_1 < \Delta_2 < \ldots$ of successive intervals of $\mathbb{N}$ whose union is $\mathbb{N}$ and a sequence (D_n) of subsets of c_{00} so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the following properties are satisfied:

1. $e_i^* \in D_n$ for all $i \in \Delta_n$.
2. $\operatorname{supp} d^* \subset \cup_{k=1}^n \Delta_k$ and $\max \operatorname{supp} d^* \in \Delta_n$ for all $d^* \in D_n$.
3. $|\operatorname{supp} d^* \cap \Delta_k| \leq 1$ for all $d^* \in D_n$ and $k \leq n$.
4. $d^*(i) \in \{b^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0, 1\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d^* \in D_n$.
5. $\operatorname{supp} d^* \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $d^* \in D_n$.
6. If $n \geq 3$ and $i \in \Delta_n$, then there exists a unique $d^* \in D_n$ with $|\operatorname{supp} d^*| > 1$ and $\max \operatorname{supp} d^* = i$.
7. If $n \geq 3$ and $d^* \in D_n$ with $|\operatorname{supp} d^*| > 1$, then we may write
$$d^* = d_1^* + b(d_2^* | \cup_{j=k+1}^l \Delta_j) + e_i^*$$
for some $1 \leq k < l \leq n-1$, $d_1^* \in D_k$, $d_2^* \in D_l$ and $i \in \Delta_n$.

Indeed, define $\Delta_k = \{k\}$ and $D_k = \{e_k^*\}$ for $k \leq 2$. Assume that Δ_k and D_k have been defined for all $k \leq n$. To define D_{n+1} and Δ_{n+1} we need to introduce some terminology.

If ξ^* and η^* are elements of $\cup_{k=1}^n D_k$, then we say that (ξ^*, η^*) is a *linked pair* provided that there exist integers $1 \leq k < l \leq n$ with $\xi^* \in D_k$, $\eta^* \in D_l$ and $\operatorname{supp} \xi^* \cup \operatorname{supp}[\eta^* | (\cup_{j=k+1}^l \Delta_j)] \in \mathcal{F}$ without being a maximal element. Denote by Σ_n the set of all possible linked pairs formed by elements of

$\cup_{k=1}^{n} D_k$. Note that $(e_i^*, e_j^*) \in \Sigma_n$ whenever $i \in \Delta_k$, $j \in \Delta_l$ and $1 \leq k < l \leq n$. Let Δ_{n+1} be the interval adjacent to Δ_n having $|\Sigma_n|$ elements. Let $\sigma_n \colon \Sigma_n \to \Delta_{n+1}$ be an injection. Define

$$D_{n+1} = \{\xi^* + b\eta^*|(\cup_{i=k+1}^{l} \Delta_i) + e^*_{\sigma_n(\xi^*,\eta^*)} \, : \\ (\xi^*, \eta^*) \in \Sigma_n\} \cup \{e_i^* : i \in \Delta_{n+1}\}$$

The inductive construction of (D_n) and (Δ_n) is now complete. It is straightforward to check that properties $(1) - (7)$ are satisfied.

Let $D = \cup_n D_n$ and define a norm on c_{00} by

$$\|x\| = \sup\{|\sum_i d^*(i)x(i)| : d^* \in D\}$$

This is indeed a norm because of (1). X is the completion of c_{00} under this norm. Observe that, under natural identification, $D \subset B_{X^*}$.

Lemma 3.1. *(e_n) is a normalized, shrinking basis for X and X^* is isomorphic to ℓ_1.*

Proof. Property (4) implies that $|d^*(i)| \leq 1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d^* \in D$. Combining this with (1) we infer that (e_n) is a normalized sequence in X.

To show that (e_n) is a Schauder basis for X it suffices proving that $\|d^*|I\| \leq 2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d^* \in D_n$ and initial intervals I of $\mathbb{N}$. This is done by induction on n, the cases $n \leq 2$ being trivial. Assuming that the assertion holds for some $n \geq 2$, let $d^* \in D_{n+1}$. Property (7) allows us write

$$d^* = d_1^* + b(d_2^*| \cup_{j=k+1}^{l} \Delta_j) + e_i^*$$

for some $1 \leq k < l \leq n$, $d_1^* \in D_k$, $d_2^* \in D_l$ and $i \in \Delta_{n+1}$. Let I be an initial interval of $\mathbb{N}$. If $i \in I$, then $d^*|I = d^*$ and so $\|d^*|I\| \leq 1$. Next assume $i \notin I$. If $\max I \leq \max \Delta_k$, then $d^*|I = d_1^*|I$ and the assertion follows from the induction hypothesis applied on d_1^*. In case $\max I > \max \Delta_k$, consider the interval $J = I \cap \cup_{j=k+1}^{l} \Delta_j$. The induction hypothesis applied on d_2^* now yields that $\|d_2^*|J\| \leq 4$. Thus,

$$\|d^*|I\| \leq \|d_1^*\| + b\|d_2^*|J\| \leq 1 + (1/4)4 = 2$$

completing the inductive step. Therefore, (e_n) is a normalized Schauder basis for X.

Evidently, properties $(1) - (7)$ guarantee that X, (e_n), D and (Δ_n) satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 and hence X is an $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ space. We finally show that (e_n) is shrinking which in turn will give us that X^* is isomorphic to ℓ_1. To this end, it is sufficient to show that every normalized block basis (u_n) of (e_n) is weakly null. We know, because of (5), that the supports of the elements of D belong to the hereditary and compact family $\mathcal{F}$. The same holds true for elements in $\overline{D}^{w^*}$ and so $\lim_n d^* u_n = 0$ for every $d^* \in \overline{D}^{w^*}$. We deduce from Rainwater's Theorem that (u_n) is weakly null. $\square$

We remark that because of (4), $\overline{D}^{w^*}$ is countable and so X embeds isometrically into $C(\omega^{\omega^\alpha})$ for some $\alpha < \omega_1$ ([18], [9]). In the next lemma we describe the smallest such α.

Lemma 3.2. *X is isometric to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$.*

Proof. We first introduce some notation. Let R be a countable, compact subset of non-negative reals having 0 as a unique cluster point. Given a hereditary and pointwise compact family $\mathcal{G}$ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, we set

$$R * \mathcal{G} = \{f : \mathbb{N} \to R : \operatorname{supp} f \in \mathcal{G}\} \cup \{\vec{0}\}$$

where $\vec{0}$ stands for the zero function. Endowing $K = R^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the cartesian topology, we see that $R * \mathcal{G}$ is a countable, compact subset of K.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{A}_n = \{F \subset \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq n\}$. Also let $\mathcal{A}_\omega = \mathcal{F}$. It is well known that for all ordinals $\xi \leq \omega$, $\mathcal{A}_\xi$ is a hereditary and pointwise compact family of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ such that ${\mathcal{A}_\xi}^{(\xi)} = \{\emptyset\}$.

Claim: $(R * \mathcal{A}_\xi)^{(\xi)} = \{\vec{0}\}$ for all $\xi \leq \omega$.

We first prove the claim when $\xi = n < \omega$, by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$. When $n = 1$, the proof is straightforward since

$$R * \mathcal{A}_1 = \{r\chi_{\{k\}} : r \in R,\, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

Assume the assertion is true for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that for each $k \leq n$ we have that

$$R * \mathcal{A}_k = \{f \in R * \mathcal{A}_n : |\operatorname{supp} f| \leq k\} \cup \{\vec{0}\}$$

It is also easy to see that the set of the isolated points of $R * \mathcal{A}_n$ consists precisely of functions in $R * \mathcal{A}_n$ whose support contains exactly n points. It follows now that

$$(R * \mathcal{A}_n)^{(1)} = R * \mathcal{A}_{n-1}$$

and hence $(R * \mathcal{A}_n)^{(n)} = \{\vec{0}\}$ because of the induction hypothesis. (Here we made use of the following easy fact: Suppose A is a countable compact metric space, B a closed subset of A with $B^{(m)} = \{t\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in B$. If $A \setminus B$ is the set of the isolated points of A, then $A^{(m+1)} = \{t\}$).

We next prove the claim for $\xi = \omega$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$L_n = \{f \in R * \mathcal{A}_\omega : |\operatorname{supp} f| \leq n\} \cup \{\vec{0}\}$$

Of course, L_n is a closed subset of $R*\mathcal{A}_\omega$ and $L_n \subset R*\mathcal{A}_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is also clear that $R * \mathcal{A}_\omega = \cup_{n=1}^\infty L_n$. We now observe that if (f_n) is a sequence in $R * \mathcal{A}_\omega$ converging to $f \in R * \mathcal{A}_\omega$ and there exist integers $k_1 < k_2 < \dots$ with $f_n \in L_{k_{n+1}} \setminus L_{k_n}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $f = \vec{0}$. Indeed, if $d_n = \min \operatorname{supp} f_n$, then $d_n > k_n - 2$ as $\operatorname{supp} f_n \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $\lim_n d_n = \infty$ and so $f = \vec{0}$.

We conclude from the above that if L is a closed subset of $R * \mathcal{A}_\omega$ and $\vec{0} \notin L$, then $L \subset L_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the claim holds when $\xi = n$ we obtain that $L^{(n+1)} = \emptyset$. We deduce from this that $(R * \mathcal{A}_\omega)^{(\omega)} \subset \{\vec{0}\}$. For the reverse inclusion, fix some $r > 0$ in R and notice that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$M_n = \{f \in R * \mathcal{A}_\omega : \ f(n) = r, \, n = \min \operatorname{supp} f\}$$

is homeomorphic to $R * \mathcal{A}_{n+1}$ with $M_n^{(n+1)} = \{r\chi_{\{n\}}\}$. Therefore, $r\chi_{\{n\}} \in (R * \mathcal{A}_\omega)^{(n+1)}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and thus $\vec{0} \in (R * \mathcal{A}_\omega)^{(\omega)}$. This completes the proof of the claim.

We are now able to complete the proof of the lemma. To this end, let $R = \{b^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0, 1\}$. We define a map $\phi \colon \overline{D}^{w^*} \to R * \mathcal{F}$ by the rule

$$\phi d^* = \sum_{n \in \operatorname{supp} d^*} d^*(n) \chi_{\{n\}}$$

for all $d^* \in \overline{D}^{w^*}$ ($\phi 0 = \vec{0}$). Properties (4) and (5) of D yield that ϕ is well defined, injective and continuous when $\overline{D}^{w^*}$ is endowed the w^*-topology. It follows now that $\overline{D}^{w^*}$ is w^*-homeomorphic to a subset of $[1, \omega^\omega]$ and so X is isometric to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$. □

In the sequel, if $u = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n e_n$ is a vector in X, we set $\|u\|_{c_0} = \sup_n |a_n|$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let (u_n) be a normalized block basis of (e_n). Then the following properties hold:*

1. *If $\lim_n \|u_n\|_{c_0} = 0$, then some subsequence of (u_n) is equivalent to the c_0 basis.*
2. *If there is some $\delta > 0$ so that $\|u_n\|_{c_0} > \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then some subsequence of (u_n) admits ℓ_1 as a spreading model.*

Proof. To prove (1) let $k_n = \max \operatorname{supp} u_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Passing to a subsequence of (u_n) if necessary, using the fact that $\lim_n \|u_n\|_{c_0} = 0$, we may assume without loss of generality, that

$$\|u_n\|_{c_0} < 1/2^{k_{n-1}}, \, \forall \, n \geq 2$$

If $d^* \in D$, let m denote the smallest integer in the support of d^*. Note that $|\operatorname{supp} d^*| \leq m + 2$, thanks to (5). Next, let n_1 be the smallest integer n for which $\operatorname{supp} u_n$ intersects $\operatorname{supp} d^*$. It follows that $m \leq k_{n_1}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^\infty |d^* u_n| &\leq |d^* u_{n_1}| + \sum_{n=n_1+1}^\infty |d^* u_n| \leq 1 + \sum_{n=n_1+1}^\infty (m+2)/2^{k_{n-1}} \\ &\leq 1 + \sum_{n=n_1+1}^\infty (k_{n-1}+2)/2^{k_{n-1}} \leq 1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty (n+2)/2^n \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that (u_n) is equivalent to the c_0 basis. For the second part of this lemma, let $i_n \in \operatorname{supp} u_n$ satisfy $|e_{i_n}^* u_n| \geq \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Claim: For every $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $F \subset M$ with $|F| = k$ and $d^* \in D$ with $\min M \leq \min \operatorname{supp} d^*$ and $|\operatorname{supp} d^*| \leq 2k + 1$, so that $\operatorname{supp} d^* \cap \operatorname{supp} u_n = \{i_n\}$ and $|d^* u_n| \geq \delta b$ for all $n \in F$.

We prove the claim by induction on k. The case $k = 1$ is trivial as $e_j^* \in D$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $k \geq 2$ and that the claim holds for $k - 1$. Without loss of generality assume that $\min M > 2k + 1$. The induction hypothesis yields some $d_1^* \in D$ and $F_1 \subset M$ with $\min M \leq \min \operatorname{supp} d_1^*$, $|\operatorname{supp} d_1^*| \leq 2k - 1$, $|F_1| = k - 1$, $\operatorname{supp} d_1^* \cap \operatorname{supp} u_n = \{i_n\}$ and $|d_1^* u_n| \geq \delta b$ for all $n \in F_1$. Let $m = \max F_1$. Choose $l \in \mathbb{N}$ so that both $\operatorname{supp} d_1^*$ and $\operatorname{supp} u_m$ are contained in $\cup_{j=1}^{l} \Delta_j$. We next choose $m_1 \in M$, $m_1 > m$, so that $\min \operatorname{supp} u_{m_1} > \max \Delta_l$. It follows now that $(d_1^*, e_{i_{m_1}}^*)$ is a linked pair. Choose $l_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\min \Delta_{l_1} > \max \operatorname{supp} u_{m_1}$. We may now find some $t \in \Delta_{l_1}$ so that

$$d^* = d_1^* + b e_{i_{m_1}}^* + e_t^* \in D$$

Evidently, d^* and $F = F_1 \cup \{m_1\}$ satisfy the claim for k.

We deduce now from the preceding claim that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every subsequence (u_{m_n}) of (u_n), there exist $d^* \in D$ and indices $m_{i_1} < \cdots < m_{i_k}$ so that $|d^* u_{m_{i_j}}| \geq \delta b$ for all $j \leq k$. An application of Ramsey's theorem and a diagonalization argument finally yield a subsequence (u_{k_n}) of (u_n) so that for every $F \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|F| \leq \min F$ there exists $d^* \in D$ such that $|d^* u_{k_n}| \geq \delta b$ for all $n \in F$. Therefore, some subsequence of (u_{k_n}) admits ℓ_1 as a spreading model. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The first part of the theorem follows directly from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2. For the second part, let (x_n) be a normalized weakly null sequence in X. By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality, that (x_n) is equivalent to a normalized block basis (u_n) of (e_n). Then either $\lim_n \|u_n\|_{c_0} = 0$, in which case (1) of Lemma 3.3 implies that some subsequence of (x_n) is equivalent to the c_0 basis, or, there is some $\delta > 0$ and a subsequence (u_{k_n}) of (u_n) so that $\|u_{k_n}\|_{c_0} \geq \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows now by (2) of Lemma 3.3, that some subsequence of (x_n) admits ℓ_1 as a spreading model. It is shown in [12], that every normalized weakly null sequence in $C(\omega^\omega)$ which admits ℓ_1 as a spreading model, has a subsequence equivalent to a subsequence of the natural basis of Schreier's space. Since X is isometric to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$, we conclude that (x_n) has a subsequence equivalent to a subsequence of the natural basis of Schreier's space. We finally note that (e_n) clearly satisfies (2) of Lemma 3.3 and so it has a subsequence equivalent to a subsequence of the natural basis of Schreier's space. $\square$

References

[1] D. Alspach, *Quotients of $C[0,1]$ with separable dual*, Israel J. Math. **29** (1978), 360–384.

[2] D. Alspach, *A quotient of $C(\omega^\omega)$ which is not isomorphic to a subspace of $C(\alpha)$, $\alpha < \omega_1$*, Israel J. Math. **35** (1980), 49–60.

[3] D. Alspach and Y. Benyamini, *A geometrical property of $C(K)$ spaces*, Israel J. Math. **64** (1988), 179–194.

[4] D. Alspach, R. Judd and E. Odell, *The Szlenk and local ℓ_1 indices*, Positivity **9** (2005), 1–44.

[5] S.A. Argyros and R. Haydon, *A hereditarily indecomposable $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ space that solves the scalar-plus-compact problem*, Acta Math. **206** (2011), 1–54.

[6] S.A. Argyros and V. Kanellopoulos, *Determining c_0 in $C(K)$ spaces*, Fund. Math. **187** (2005), 61–93.

[7] Y. Benyamini, *An extension theorem for separable Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. **29** (1978), 24–30.

[8] Y. Benyamini and J. Lindenstrauss, *A predual of ℓ_1 which is not isomorphic to a $C(K)$ space*, Israel J. Math. **13** (1972), 246–254.

[9] C. Bessaga and A. Pelczynski, *Spaces of continuous functions IV*, Studia Math. **19** (1960), 53–62.

[10] J. Bourgain and F. Delbaen, *A class of special $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ spaces*, Acta Math. **145** (1980), 155–176.

[11] D. Freeman, E. Odell and Th. Schlumprecht, *The universality of ℓ_1 as a dual space*, Math. Ann. **351** (2011), 149–186.

[12] I. Gasparis, E. Odell and B. Wahl, *Weakly null sequences in the Banach space $C(K)$*, in Methods in Banach space theorey, J. Castillo and W. B. Johnson Editors, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series no. 337, Cambridge University Press 2006.

[13] W.B. Johnson and M. Zippin, *On subspaces of quotients of $(\sum G_n)_{\ell_p}$ and $(\sum G_n)_{c_0}$*, Israel J. Math. **13** (1972), 311-316.

[14] D. Lewis and C. Stegall, *Banach spaces whose duals are isomorphic to $\ell_1(\Gamma)$*, J. Funct. Anal. **12** (1973), 177–187.

[15] J. Lindenstrauss and A. Pelczynski, *Absolutely summing operators in $\mathcal{L}_p$ spaces and their applications*, Studia Math. **29** (1968), 275–326.

[16] J. Lindenstrauss and H.P. Rosenthal, *The $\mathcal{L}_p$ spaces*, Israel J. Math. **7** (1969), 325–349.

[17] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach spaces I-II*, Springer-Verlag, New-York (1977).

[18] S. Mazurkiewicz and W. Sierpinski, *Contributions a la topologie des ensembles denombrables*, Fund. Math. **1** (1920), 17–27.

[19] E. Odell, *Ordinal indices in Banach spaces*, Extracta Math. **19** (2004), 93–125.

[20] H.P. Rosenthal, *On factors of $C[0,1]$ with non-separable dual*, Israel J. Math. **13** (1972), 361–378.

[21] H.P. Rosenthal, *The Banach spaces $C(K)$*, in: W.B. Johnson, J. Lindenstrauss (Eds), Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces, vol. 2, North-Holland, 2003, pp. 1547–1602.

[22] C. Samuel, *Indice de Szlenk des $C(K)$ (K espace topologique denombrable)*, Seminar on the geometry of Banach spaces vol. I, II (Paris 1983), Publ. Math. Univ. Paris VII **18** (1984), 81–91.

[23] J. Schreier, *Ein Gegenbeispiel zur theorie der schwachen konvergenz*, Studia Math. **2** (1930), 58–62.

[24] W. Szlenk, *The non existence of a separable reflexive Banach space universal for all separable reflexive Banach spaces*, Studia Math. **30** (1968), 53–61.

Department of Mathematics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, 54124, Greece

E-mail address: `ioagaspa@math.auth.gr`